

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 11 are independent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews III, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,141). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 11, the Examiner alleges that Matthews et al. discloses the feature of displaying size information that identifies a size of a television picture to be displayed, and cites column 9, line 65 - column 10, line 10 of Matthews et al. to support his position.

Matthews et al., including the cited portion, places hyperlinks within the EPG so that a viewer can select a desired hyperlink associated with a program title displayed in the EPG to obtain additional information associated with the program. When the user selects a particular hyperlink, the Web browser is automatically launched to display the Web page associated with the selected hyperlink. However, Matthews et al. nowhere discloses displaying the size information identifying the size of the television picture to be displayed in the EPG or on the screen. The cited portion of Matthews et al. merely describes the process of storing target resources referenced by the hyperlinks and does not

disclose the feature of displaying the size information of a television picture to be displayed (with a detailed/different version of the data information) as required by the claims.

In Applicants' invention, for example, the size of the television picture that will be displayed if a particular version of the data information is selected, is displayed on the screen for the viewer. This is advantageous because it allows the viewer to determine if the viewer wants to switch into the data information picture mode by considering the television display size information, whereby the viewer has a complete control over the television pictures and data information displayed to the viewer. See, for example, page 12, lines 5-11 of the specification.

Furthermore, Smith does not overcome this deficiency of Matthews et al. since Smith also is completely silent about displaying the size information of a television picture to be displayed.

Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*:

displaying simple data information on the screen as a
simple data information picture . . . , the simple data
information including size information identifying a
size of a television picture to be displayed

as recited in independent claim 1;

displaying television picture size information
identifying a picture size of a general television picture
to be displayed

as recited in independent claim 7;

displaying a picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a different version of the data information

as recited in independent claim 8; and

the PE unit displays, on the screen, simple data information of the detected data information . . . , and the simple data information includes a summary version of the data information and television picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information

as recited in independent claim 11.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 11 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claims 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews III, et al. in view of Smith, and further in view of Peyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,208), and Garber (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,616). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed hereinabove, the combination of Matthews et al. and Smith does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified features recited in independent claim 11 from which claims 15 and 16 depend. Further, Peyer et al. and Garber do not correct the deficiencies in the combination of Matthews

et al. and Smith since these references are merely relied on for teaching Java Script and CSS parser.

Therefore, independent claim 11 and its dependent claims are patentable over the applied references, and the rejection must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicit an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By *James T. Eller, Jr.* #40,953
James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

JTE/EHC:lmh